arXiv:hep-ph/0212076v2 6 Mar 2003

Operator relation among neutrino fields and oscillation formulas in matter

Kanji Fujii^{*1}, Chikage Habe^{*1} and Massimo Blasone^{*2}

^{*1} *Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-0810, Japan*

^{*2} *Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College, Prince Consort Road, London SW7 2BW, U.K.*
and Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università di Salerno, I-84100 Salerno, Italy

(February 1, 2008)

Starting with the relation between two kinds of neutrino field operators corresponding to definite flavor and mass states, we investigate if the usual evolution relations for neutrino oscillation in matter can be consistently derived, in the case of high energy neutrinos. A negative answer is obtained contrary to an earlier result [P. D. Mannheim, Phys. Rev. D **37** (1988) 1935]. The reason for such a difference relies essentially on the Bogolyubov transformation between two kinds of momentum-helicity creation- and annihilation-operators with definite flavors and masses, which was not taken into account in previous treatments.

I. INTRODUCTION

In view of the great phenomenological and theoretical relevance of neutrino mixing and oscillations, much effort has been recently devoted to a full quantum field theoretical analysis of this phenomenon both in vacuum as well as in matter [1–14]. Among the various approaches which have been developed, the one proposed by Blasone and Vitiello [4](hereafter, referred to BV) is based on two kinds of Hilbert spaces, i.e. the flavor- and the mass-Hilbert spaces, and related considerations in the case of vacuum oscillations have been published in Refs. [4–7,9–11]. In these references it has been pointed out that non-standard oscillation terms due to the non-trivial nature of the mixing transformations do indeed appear in the full oscillation formula obtained in quantum field theory.

The aim of the present work is to develop field-theoretical considerations concerning neutrino oscillations in matter along the line of BV [4] and the one developed by Fujii, Habe and Yabuki [5]. We examine this task by assuming the static medium and the extreme-relativistic case which are to be defined exactly in Sec.II. In this respect, it is useful to remember that, when we want to define a flavor neutrino state with definite momentum and helicity, there appear arbitrary mass parameters μ_λ's [5,6,10], so that we cannot estimate the magnitude of μ_λ's in comparison with the neutrino momentum. Mannheim has investigated the same problem in the paper [1] published in somewhat early stage[1]: his conclusion is that the standard Mikheyev-Smirnov-Wolfenstein (MSW) formalism [15] is derived. However, after the considerations developed in the following, we obtain a negative conclusion against that of Mannheim [1]. The essential point is that, in quantities related to the evolution relation of flavor neutrino states, Mannheim dropped the effect coming from Bogolyubov transformation between the two kinds of creation- and annihilation-operators (with definite momentum and helicity) corresponding to the flavor- and the mass-eigenstates. We discuss this point in detail in this paper.

In the following we consider the problem in the 2-flavor case for simplicity, although the above conclusion will be seen to hold true also in the many flavor case.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. General framework

We investigate the neutrino oscillation in matter on the basis of the electro-weak unified theory, in which the known neutrinos participate in the weak interaction of V-A type, mediated by $W^\pm$- and Z^0-bosons. For low momentumtransfers, $|q^2| \ll m_W^2, m_Z^2$, the effective interaction Lagrangian is

---

[1] When one of the present authors (K.F.) reported the main part of the present work at International Workshop on the Quantum Field Theory of Particle Mixing and Oscillations, 13-15 June 2002, Vietri sul Mare (Salerno), Dr. C.Y. Cardall called attention to Mannheim's work.

$$\begin{aligned} L_{weak}^{eff}(x) = & -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}\Big\{(\bar{\nu}_e v^\alpha e)(\bar{e} v_\alpha \nu_e) + (\bar{\nu}_\mu v^\alpha \mu)(\bar{\mu} v_\alpha \nu_\mu) + \cdots \\ & + \frac{\kappa_\omega}{2}(\sum_\rho \bar{\nu}_\rho v^\alpha \nu_\rho)\left(-\bar{e} v_\alpha e + 4\sin^2\theta_W \bar{e}\gamma_\alpha e\right) + \cdots \Big\} \\ & = -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}\Big\{\bar{\nu}_e v^\alpha \nu_e ((1 - \frac{\kappa_\omega}{2})\bar{e} v_\alpha e + 2\kappa_\omega \sin^2\theta_W \bar{e}\gamma_\alpha e) \\ & + \sum_{\rho \neq e}(\bar{\nu}_\rho v^\alpha \nu_\rho)\kappa_\omega(-\frac{1}{2}\bar{e} v_\alpha e + 2\sin^2\theta_W \bar{e}\gamma_\alpha e) + \cdots \Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where $v^\alpha = \gamma^\alpha(1+\gamma_5)$ with $\vec{\gamma} = -\rho_y \otimes \vec{\sigma}, \gamma^4 = \rho_x \otimes I, \gamma_5 = -\rho_z \otimes I$ in the Kramers representation [16,5,10]; $\sqrt{\kappa_w} m_z/m_w = 1/\cos\theta_w, (\kappa_w)_{exp} \approx 1; G_F \approx 1.027 \times 10^{-5}/m_P^2$. Hereafter we take $\kappa_w = 1$. (As to the details of the notations below, see Refs. [5,10].)

For neutrino propagation in matter, we define

$$n^{(e)}(x)_\alpha = i\langle \bar{e}(x) v_\alpha e(x)\rangle_{matt} \approx i\langle \bar{e}(x)\gamma_\alpha e(x)\rangle_{matt}, \tag{2.2}$$

which plays the role of an external field. Under the adiabatic approximation, $(n^{(e)}(x)_\alpha)$ may be regarded as x-independent over a wide range. With the aim of presenting the logical structure of the problem as simply as possible, we assume $(n^{(e)}(x)_\alpha)$ to be x-independent in the same way as Mannheim [1]. We define the time-like 4-vector $(u_\alpha) = (\vec{u}, iu_0)$ with $u^\alpha u_\alpha = -1$ such that it reduces to $(\vec{0}, i)$ in the rest frame of medium; thus, we can write $(n^{(e)}(x)_\alpha) = (n_{(e)} u_\alpha)$ which reduces to $(\vec{0}, in_{(e)})$ in the rest frame of medium.

By noting that

$$\frac{1}{i}\ \not{n}^{(e)} P_L = \not{n}^{(e)}\frac{1+\gamma_5}{2i} = n_{(e)}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \vec{\sigma}\vec{u} + u_0 I \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.3}$$

and by defining

$$b_1 \equiv \sqrt{2} G_F n_{(e)} \quad , \quad b_0 \equiv \sqrt{2} G_F n_{(e)}(2\sin^2\theta_w - \frac{1}{2}), \tag{2.4}$$

the effective Lagrangian related with the present consideration for the 2-flavor case in expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} L_{eff}^{matt}(x) &= -\begin{pmatrix} \bar{\nu}_e(x) & \bar{\nu}_\mu(x) \end{pmatrix}\left[\not{\partial} + M^0 + \begin{pmatrix} (b_0 + b_1)\ \not{u} P_L/i & 0 \\ 0 & b_0\ \not{u} P_L/i \end{pmatrix}\right]\begin{pmatrix} \nu_e(x) \\ \nu_\mu(x) \end{pmatrix} + L_{int}(x) \\ &= -\begin{pmatrix} \bar{\nu}_e(x) & \bar{\nu}_\mu(x) \end{pmatrix}\left[\not{\partial} + \begin{pmatrix} m_{ee} & N & m_{e\mu} & 0 \\ 0 & m_{ee} & 0 & m_{e\mu} \\ m_{\mu e} & 0 & m_{\mu\mu} & N' \\ 0 & m_{\mu e} & 0 & m_{\mu\mu} \end{pmatrix}\right]\begin{pmatrix} \nu_e(x) \\ \nu_\mu(x) \end{pmatrix} + L_{int}(x) \\ &\equiv L_F^{matt}(x) + L_{int}(x), \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where $L_{int}(x)$ is assumed to include no bilinear term of neutrino fields, and hereafter its contributions are neglected; N and N' are defined by

$$N \equiv (b_0 + b_1)(\vec{\sigma}\vec{u} + u_0 I) \quad , \quad N' = b_0(\vec{\sigma}\vec{u} + u_0 I). \tag{2.6}$$

The mass matrix M^0 in the 2-flavor case can be taken with no loss of generality, as $m_{e\mu} = m_{\mu e}, m_{\mu\mu} > m_{ee} \geq 0$; then, the eigenvalues, m_1 and m_2,

$$m_{1(2)} = \frac{1}{2}\left(m_{ee} + m_{\mu\mu} - (+)\sqrt{(m_{\mu\mu} - m_{ee})^2 + 4m_{e\mu}^2}\right) \tag{2.7}$$

satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 \geq 0 \quad & \text{for} \quad \sqrt{m_{ee} m_{\mu\mu}} \geq |m_{e\mu}|, \\ m_1 < 0 \quad & \text{for} \quad \sqrt{m_{ee} m_{\mu\mu}} < |m_{e\mu}|. \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

From the mixing relation of the "mass-eigenfield" $\nu_j(x)$'s

$$\nu_\rho(x) = \sum_j z_{\rho j}^{1/2} \nu_j(x) \quad \text{with} \quad Z^{1/2} = [z_{\rho j}^{1/2}] \tag{2.9}$$

satisfying $Z^{1/2\dagger} Z^{1/2} = I$ as well as

$$Z^{1/2\dagger} M^0 Z^{1/2} = m_{diag} = \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & 0 \\ 0 & m_2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.10}$$

we can take

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu_e(x) \\ \nu_\mu(x) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & \sin\theta \\ -\sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1(x) \\ \nu_2(x) \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.11}$$

with

$$\tan\theta = \frac{1}{2m_{e\mu}}[-(m_{\mu\mu} - m_{ee}) + \sqrt{(m_{\mu\mu} - m_{ee})^2 + 4m_{e\mu}^2}]. \tag{2.12}$$

For later convenience we write the relations among $m_{\rho\sigma}$'s, m_j's and θ;

$$\begin{pmatrix} m_{ee} \\ m_{\mu\mu} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2\theta & \sin^2\theta \\ \sin^2\theta & \cos^2\theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} m_1 \\ m_2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.13}$$

$$m_{e\mu} = (m_2 - m_1)\sin\theta\cos\theta \quad , \quad \tan(2\theta) = \frac{2m_{e\mu}}{m_{\mu\mu} - m_{ee}}. \tag{2.14}$$

Employing the above relations, we can write $L_{(F)}^{matt}(x)$ given by (2.5) in terms of the mass-basis operators;

$$\begin{aligned} L_{(F)}^{matt}(x) &= -\begin{pmatrix} \bar{\nu}_1(x) & \bar{\nu}_2(x) \end{pmatrix} \left[\not{\partial} + \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & B & 0 & G \\ 0 & m_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & G & m_2 & B' \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & m_2 \end{pmatrix} \right] \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1(x) \\ \nu_2(x) \end{pmatrix} \\ &\equiv L_{(M)}^{matt}(x), \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

where 2×2 matrices B, B' and G are defined by

$$\begin{pmatrix} B & G \\ G & B' \end{pmatrix} = \kappa \otimes (\sigma\vec{u} + u_0 I) \tag{2.16}$$

with $\kappa_{11} = b_0 + b_1\cos^2\theta$, $\kappa_{12} = \kappa_{21} = b_1\cos\theta\sin\theta$ and $\kappa_{22} = b_0 + b_1\sin^2\theta$.

B. Effective Hamiltonian and eigenvalue equation

The effective Hamiltonian obtained from $L_{(M)}^{matt}(x)$, (2.15), is

$$\begin{aligned} H_{(M)}^{matt}(x) &= :\begin{pmatrix} \bar{\nu}_1(x) & \bar{\nu}_2(x) \end{pmatrix} \left[\vec{\gamma}\vec{\nabla} + \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & B & 0 & G \\ 0 & m_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & G & m_2 & B' \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & m_2 \end{pmatrix} \right] \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1(x) \\ \nu_2(x) \end{pmatrix} : \\ &= :\begin{pmatrix} \nu_1^\dagger(x) & \nu_2^\dagger(x) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -i\vec{\sigma}\vec{\nabla} & m_1 & 0 & 0 \\ m_1 & i\vec{\sigma}\vec{\nabla} + B & 0 & G \\ 0 & 0 & -i\vec{\sigma}\vec{\nabla} & m_2 \\ 0 & G & m_2 & i\vec{\sigma}\vec{\nabla} + B' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1(x) \\ \nu_2(x) \end{pmatrix} : . \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

We expand the $\nu_j(x)$ fields $(j = 1, 2)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_j(x) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \sum_{\vec{k}r} \left\{ \alpha_j(kr;x^0) u_j(kr) e^{i\vec{k}\vec{x}} + \beta_j^\dagger(kr;x^0) v_j(kr) e^{-i\vec{k}\vec{x}} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \sum_{\vec{k}r} \left\{ \alpha_j(kr;x^0) u_j(kr) + \beta_j^\dagger(-kr;x^0) v_j(-kr) e^{i\vec{k}\vec{x}} \right\}; \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

here, $u_j(kr)$ and $v_j(kr)$ are the momentum-helicity eigenfunctions satisfying

$$(i\not{k} + m_j) u_j(kr) = 0\,, \quad (-i\not{k} + m_j) v_j(kr) = 0 \quad \text{with } k_0 = \sqrt{\vec{k}^2 + m_j^2} \equiv \omega_j(k), \tag{2.19}$$

$$\beta(-kr;x^0) \equiv \beta(-\vec{k}, k_0, r; x^0)\,, \quad v(-kr) \equiv v(-\vec{k}, k_0, r). \tag{2.20}$$

By employing the concrete forms of $u_j(kr)$ and $v_j(-kr)$ given in Appendix A, we can express the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(M)}(x^0) \equiv \int d^3x H^{matt}_{(M)}(x), \tag{2.21}$$

in terms of the expansion-coefficient operators in (2.18). (See Table I as well as Eqs.(A9) and (A10) in Appendix A.) We obtain

$$\mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(M)}(x^0) = \sum_{\vec{k}r} \sum_j : w_j(k)(\alpha_j^\dagger(kr)\alpha_j(kr) - \beta_j(-kr)\beta_j^\dagger(-kr)) : + \int d^3x \sum_{j,l} \kappa_{jl} : \nu_j^\dagger(x) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \vec{\sigma}\vec{u} + u_0 \end{pmatrix} \nu_l(x) : \tag{2.22}$$

This shows that, due to the non-static($\vec{u} \neq 0$) contribution, $\mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(M)}(x^0)$ is not separable into two parts, corresponding to helicity $r = \uparrow$ or $\downarrow$, since the last integral part of (2.22) is equal to

$$\sum_{j,l} \kappa_{jl} : \int d^3x (u_0 \nu_j^\dagger(x) P_L \nu_l(x) + \nu_j^\dagger(x)(\vec{\sigma}\vec{u}) P_L \nu_l(x)) : . \tag{2.23}$$

In the static-medium approximation, i.e. $(\vec{u}, \vec{u}_0) \to (\vec{0}, 1)$, $\mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(M)}(x^0)$ is separable into two parts; in the two-flavor case we are lead to consider the 4×4 matrices $\mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(M)}(k\uparrow)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow)$ as given below.

From Eq.(2.22), we obtain the Hamiltonian in the static-medium case

$$\mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(M)}(x^0)|_{static} = \sum_{\vec{k},r} \mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(M)}(kr;x^0), \tag{2.24}$$

$$\mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(M)}(kr;x^0) = : \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_M^\dagger(kr;x^0) & \boldsymbol{\beta}_M(-kr;x^0) \end{pmatrix} H^{matt}_{(M)}(kr) \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_M(kr;x^0) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_M^\dagger(-kr;x^0) \end{pmatrix} : \tag{2.25}$$

with

$$H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\uparrow) = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 + \kappa_{11}s_1s_1 & \kappa_{12}s_1s_2 & i\kappa_{11}s_1c_1 & i\kappa_{12}s_1c_2 \\ \kappa_{12}s_2s_1 & \omega_2 + \kappa_{22}s_2s_2 & i\kappa_{12}s_2c_1 & i\kappa_{22}s_2c_2 \\ -i\kappa_{11}c_1s_1 & -i\kappa_{12}c_1s_2 & -\omega_1 + \kappa_{11}c_1c_1 & \kappa_{12}c_1c_2 \\ -i\kappa_{12}c_2s_1 & -i\kappa_{22}c_2s_2 & \kappa_{12}c_2c_1 & -\omega_2 + \kappa_{22}c_2c_2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.26}$$

$$H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow) = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 + \kappa_{11}c_1c_1 & \kappa_{12}c_1c_2 & -i\kappa_{11}c_1s_1 & -i\kappa_{12}c_1s_2 \\ \kappa_{12}c_2c_1 & \omega_2 + \kappa_{22}c_2c_2 & -i\kappa_{12}c_2s_1 & -i\kappa_{22}c_2s_2 \\ i\kappa_{11}s_1c_1 & i\kappa_{12}s_1c_2 & -\omega_1 + \kappa_{11}s_1s_1 & \kappa_{12}s_1s_2 \\ i\kappa_{12}s_2c_1 & i\kappa_{22}s_2c_2 & \kappa_{12}s_2s_1 & -\omega_2 + \kappa_{22}s_2s_2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.27}$$

Here we use the notation (in the two-flavor case)

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}_M(kr;x^0) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1(kr;x^0) \\ \alpha_2(kr;x^0) \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad \boldsymbol{\beta}_M(-kr;x^0) = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1(-kr;x^0) \\ \beta_2(-kr;x^0) \end{pmatrix}; \tag{2.28}$$

$$c_j = \cos(\chi_j/2) \quad , \quad s_j = \sin(\chi_j/2),\ cot\chi_j = |\vec{k}|/m_j.$$

The equations determining the energy eigenvalues are

$$\det[H^{matt}_{(M)}(kr)] = 0\ , \qquad r =\uparrow, \downarrow\ . \tag{2.29}$$

The concrete forms of LHS of (2.29) are given by

$$\det[H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\uparrow) - \lambda] = (\lambda^2 - \omega_1^2)(\lambda^2 - \omega_2^2) - (\lambda - k)\{\kappa_{11}(\lambda^2 - \omega_2^2) + \kappa_{22}(\lambda^2 - \omega_1^2)\} + (\lambda - k)^2 \det\kappa, \tag{2.30}$$

$$\det[H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow) - \lambda] = (\lambda^2 - \omega_1^2)(\lambda^2 - \omega_2^2) - (\lambda + k)\{\kappa_{11}(\lambda^2 - \omega_2^2) + \kappa_{22}(\lambda^2 - \omega_1^2)\} + (\lambda + k)^2 \det\kappa. \tag{2.31}$$

Hereafter we write $|\vec{k}|$ simply as k when there is no fear of confusion.

The relation of the eigenvalues obtained from Eq.(2.29) with the poles of flavor neutrino propagators will be examined in Sec.III. Here we discuss the relation of Eq.(2.29) with the eigenvalue equation obtained by Mannheim [1], i.e. Eq.(2.16) in his paper:

$$\begin{aligned} &E^4 - E^3 V - E^2(2k^2 + Vk + m_1^2 + m_2^2) + EV(k^2 + m_1^2\sin^2\theta + m_2^2\cos^2\theta) \\ &\quad + \omega_1^2\cdot\omega_2^2 + Vk(k^2 + m_1^2\sin^2\theta + m_2^2\cos^2\theta) = 0; \end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

$V = \sqrt{2}G_F n_{(e)} = b_1$ in our notation. In (2.32) the neutral current contribution is subtracted from $H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow)$ as a common term, so that in our case we have to take

$$\kappa \longrightarrow b_1 \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2\theta & \cos\theta\sin\theta \\ \cos\theta\sin\theta & \sin^2\theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad \det\kappa \longrightarrow 0. \tag{2.33}$$

Then, we obtain from (2.31)

$$\det[H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow) - \lambda] \longrightarrow (E^2 - \omega_1^2)(E^2 - \omega_2^2) - (E + k)V(E^2 - k^2 - m_1^2\sin^2\theta - m_2^2\cos^2\theta), \tag{2.34}$$

which coincides with LHS of (2.32).

In Ref. [1], Mannheim pointed out that, in the limit of high energies and weak potentials, the standard MSW formalism for neutrino oscillations in matter [15] is derived on the basis of the field theory. It seems necessary, however, for us to reexamine this conclusion in detail because of the following reasons.

Hereafter we use the terminology "*extreme-relativistic case*" to denote the limit of higher neutrino-energies and weak potentials, i.e.

$$|\vec{k}|^2 \gg \{m_j^2\text{'s}, A = 2kb_1, A_0 = 2kb_0\}. \tag{2.35}$$

Since the mass eigenvalues are obtained by taking $\omega_j \simeq k + \frac{m_j^2}{2k}$, we use

$$c_j \simeq 1 - \frac{m_j^2}{8k^2}, \quad s_j \simeq \frac{m_j}{2k}. \tag{2.36}$$

If we simply take the *super-relativistic limit*

$$c_j \longrightarrow 1, \quad s_j \longrightarrow 0 \quad \forall j, \tag{2.37}$$

then Eq.(2.27) reduces to

$$H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow) \longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 + \kappa_{11} & \kappa_{12} & 0 & 0 \\ \kappa_{12} & \omega_2 + \kappa_{22} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\omega_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\omega_2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.38}$$

which is separable with respect to $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{(M)}(k\downarrow; x^0)$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger_{(M)}(k\downarrow; x^0)$, and leads to the usually employed Hamiltonian appearing in Schrödinger equation for one-particle states of two-flavor neutrinos. (See Eq.(2.23) in Ref. [1] and the next subsection.) The eigenvalue equation for (2.38) is given by

$$\det[H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow)|_{c_j=1, s_j=0} - \lambda] = (\omega_1 + \lambda)(\omega_2 + \lambda)\left\{(\omega_1 - \lambda)(\omega_2 - \lambda) + (\omega_1 - \lambda)\kappa_{22} + (\omega_2 - \lambda)\kappa_{11} + \det\kappa\right\}. \tag{2.39}$$

The curly bracket part in RHS of (2.39) and the remaining part determine the eigenvalues of positive- and negative-energy modes, respectively. If we take $\omega_j, j = 1, 2$ to be k, which is consistent with (2.37), the curly bracket part of (2.39) is

$$\{\cdots\} \text{ of } (2.39) = (k-\lambda)(k-\lambda) + (k-\lambda)(\kappa_{11}+\kappa_{22}) + \det\kappa, \tag{2.40}$$

leading to the eigenvalues

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda - k &= \frac{1}{2}\left[(\kappa_{11}+\kappa_{22}) \pm \sqrt{(\kappa_{11}-\kappa_{22})^2 + 4(\kappa_{12})^2}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4k}\left[2A_0 + A \pm A\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.41}$$

If we write as usual

$$\lambda = k + \frac{\tilde{m}^2}{2k}, \tag{2.42}$$

we obtain

$$\tilde{m}^2 = A_0 + A \text{ or } A_0, \tag{2.43}$$

which are different from the usual ones [1,18] apart from the common factor A_0.

In order to obtain the mass eigenvalues $\{\tilde{m}^2\text{'s}\}$, we have to examine the "exact" expression (2.31), i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \det[H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow) - \lambda] = (\omega_1+\lambda)(\omega_2+\lambda)\Big\{&(\omega_1-\lambda)(\omega_2-\lambda) \\ &+ \frac{k+\lambda}{\omega_1+\lambda}(\omega_2-\lambda)\kappa_{11} + \frac{k+\lambda}{\omega_2+\lambda}(\omega_1-\lambda)\kappa_{22} + \frac{(k+\lambda)^2}{(\omega_1+\lambda)(\omega_2+\lambda)}\det\kappa\Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.44}$$

When we take, in the approximation of the extreme-relativistic case,

$$\omega_j \simeq k + \frac{m_j^2}{2k} \text{ and } \lambda = k + \frac{\tilde{m}^2}{2k}, \tag{2.45}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \{\cdots\}\text{-part in } (2.44) \simeq \frac{1}{4k^2}(m_1^2-\tilde{m}^2)(m_2^2-\tilde{m}^2) + \left(1-\frac{m_1^2}{4k^2}\right)\frac{k\kappa_{11}}{k}\cdot\frac{m_2^2-\tilde{m}^2}{2k} + \left(1-\frac{m_2^2}{4k^2}\right)\frac{k\kappa_{22}}{k}\cdot\frac{m_1^2-\tilde{m}^2}{2k} \\ + \left(1-\frac{m_1^2+m_2^2}{4k^2}\right)\frac{k^2\det\kappa}{k^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.46}$$

In accordance with the approximation in the extreme-relativistic case, we neglect all terms with higher order than $\{m_j^2, \tilde{m}^2, A, A_0\}/k^2$ in comparison with 1, and correction terms to terms such as (relevant mass)^2 and $k\kappa_{ij}$ are to be dropped. Then (2.46) is consistently expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \{\cdots\}\text{-part in } (2.44) \simeq \frac{1}{4k^2}(m_1^2-\tilde{m}^2)(m_2^2-\tilde{m}^2) + \frac{A_0 + A\cos^2\theta}{2k}\cdot\frac{m_2^2-\tilde{m}^2}{2k} + \frac{A_0 + A\sin^2\theta}{2k}\cdot\frac{m_1^2-\tilde{m}^2}{2k} \\ + \frac{1}{4k^2}\det\begin{pmatrix} A_0 + A\cos^2\theta & A\sin\theta\cos\theta \\ A\sin\theta\cos\theta & A_0 + A\sin^2\theta \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.47}$$

It should be noted that, although (2.47) is also obtained from (2.39) by employing (2.45), such a procedure includes internal inconsistency. Through detailed considerations we can prove that, when the approximation in the extreme-relativistic case is consistently performed, we obtain the (approximate) eigenvalues which coincide with the usual ones [1,18]. The detailed derivation is given in Appendix B. However, a serious problem may arise with the energy eigenvectors. This will be investigated in Sec.IV.

C. Further remarks on derivation of the usual relations

In this subsection we give additional remarks on the implication of the statement that the usual quantum mechanical formulas are obtained by performing the replacement (2.37).

First we note the flavor neutrino field $\nu_\rho(x)(\rho = e, \mu, \cdots)$ is expanded as

$$\nu_\rho(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}}\sum_{\vec{k},r}\left\{\alpha_\rho(kr;x^0)u_\rho(kr)+\beta^\dagger_\rho(-kr;x^0)v_\rho(-kr)\right\}e^{-i\vec{k}\vec{x}}, \tag{2.48}$$

where $u_\rho(kr)$ and $v_\rho(kr)$ satisfy

$$(i\not{k}+\mu_\rho)u_\rho(kr)=0\,,\quad (-i\not{k}+\mu_\rho)v_\rho(kr)=0 \tag{2.49}$$

with an arbitrary μ_ρ [5,7]; $\beta_\rho(-kr;x^0)$ and $v_\rho(-kr)$ are defined in the same way as (2.20). Here we are writing expressions and relations for the case of arbitrary flavor number. The relation of

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(kr;x^0)=\begin{pmatrix}\alpha_e(kr;x^0)\\ \alpha_\mu(kr;x^0)\\ \vdots\end{pmatrix}\,,\quad \boldsymbol{\beta}_F(-kr;x^0)=\begin{pmatrix}\beta_e(-kr;x^0)\\ \beta_\mu(-kr;x^0)\\ \vdots\end{pmatrix} \tag{2.50}$$

with $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_M(kr;x^0)$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_M(-kr;x^0)$ is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(kr;x^0)\\ \boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger_F(-kr;x^0)\end{pmatrix}=\mathcal{K}(k)\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_M(kr;x^0)\\ \boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger_M(-kr;x^0)\end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.51}$$

where the matrix [5,10] is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{K}(k)=\begin{pmatrix}P(k) & i\Lambda(k)\\ i\Lambda(k) & P(k)\end{pmatrix}\equiv\begin{pmatrix}\mathcal{K}(k)_{\rho j} & \mathcal{K}(k)_{\rho\bar{j}}\\ \mathcal{K}(k)_{\bar{\rho}j} & \mathcal{K}(k)_{\bar{\rho}\bar{j}}\end{pmatrix},\\ P(k)=[P(k)_{\rho j}]=[z^{1/2}_{\rho j}\rho_{\rho j}(k)]\,,\quad \Lambda(k)=[z^{1/2}_{\rho j}\lambda_{\rho j}(k)].\end{aligned} \tag{2.52}$$

(As to the definition of $\rho_{\rho j}$ and $\lambda_{\rho j}$, see Appendix A.)

In *the extreme-relativistic case* (2.35), we employ $\omega_j=k+m_j^2/(2k), c_j=1-m_j^2/(8k^2), s_j=m_j/(2k)$; on the contrary, it is not appropriate for us to employ

$$\rho_{\rho j}=1-\frac{(\mu_\rho-m_j)^2}{8k^2}\quad,\quad \lambda_{\rho j}=\frac{\mu_\rho-m_j}{2k}, \tag{2.53}$$

since μ_ρ is arbitrary. Notwithstanding this, the direct way for deriving the usually employed quantum-mechanical relations is, as already seen partially from the consideration in the preceding subsection B, to take (2.37), i.e.

$$c_j\longrightarrow 1\quad,\quad s_j\longrightarrow 0\qquad\forall j \tag{2.54}$$

in $H^{matt}_{(M)}(kr)$ and also

$$\rho_{\rho j}\longrightarrow 1\quad,\quad \lambda_{\rho j}\longrightarrow 0\qquad\forall\rho,j;\qquad\text{thus}\qquad \mathcal{K}(k)\longrightarrow I_2\otimes Z^{1/2}. \tag{2.55}$$

In *this super-relativistic limit*, the neutrino- and the antineutrino-operators decouple as seen from (2.26) and (2.27); $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_M(k\uparrow;x^0)$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_M(-k\downarrow;x^0)$ behave like free operators (as far as $L_{int}(x)$ in (2.5) is neglected). We obtain the Hamiltonian for $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_M(k\downarrow;x^0)$ expressed by

$$\mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow;\alpha_M)=\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\dagger_M(k\downarrow;x^0)\mathcal{E}^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow)\boldsymbol{\alpha}_M(k\downarrow;x^0), \tag{2.56}$$

$$\mathcal{E}^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow)=\begin{pmatrix}k+\frac{m_1^2}{2k}+\kappa_{11} & \kappa_{12}\\ \kappa_{12} & k+\frac{m_2^2}{2k}+\kappa_{22}\end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.57}$$

This Hamiltonian is equal to

$$\mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(F}(k\downarrow;\alpha_F)=\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\dagger_F(k\downarrow;x^0)\mathcal{E}^{matt}_{(F)}(k\downarrow)\boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(k\downarrow;x^0), \tag{2.58}$$

$$\mathcal{E}^{matt}_{(F)}(k\downarrow)=Z^{1/2}\mathcal{E}^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow)Z^{1/2\dagger} \tag{2.59}$$

$$=k+\frac{\bar{m}^2+A_0}{2k}+\frac{1}{4k}\begin{pmatrix}2A-\Delta m^2\cos(2\theta) & \Delta m^2\sin(2\theta)\\ \Delta m^2\sin(2\theta) & \Delta m^2\cos(2\theta)\end{pmatrix}; \tag{2.60}$$

here $\bar{m}^2 = \frac{m_1^2+m_2^2}{2}, \Delta m^2 = m_2^2 - m_1^2$. Since left-handed neutrino are produced through the weak interaction in, e.g., center region of the sun, Eq.(2.60) coincide with Hamiltonian employed in the usual quantum mechanical consideration (e.g. [18]).

The eigenvalues of $\mathcal{E}^{matt}_{(F)}(k\downarrow)$ are expressed as

$$\tilde{E}_j(k\downarrow) = k + \frac{\tilde{m}_j^2(\downarrow)}{2k} \tag{2.61}$$

with the effective masses $\tilde{m}_j^2(\downarrow)$ given by

$$\tilde{m}^2_{1(2)}(\downarrow) = \bar{m}^2 + A_0 + \frac{1}{2}\left\{A - (+)\sqrt{(A - \Delta m^2\cos(2\theta))^2 + (\Delta m^2 \sin(2\theta))^2}\right\} \tag{2.62}$$

We define [18] the mixing angle $\tilde{\theta}$ and the operators $\tilde{\alpha}_j(k\downarrow; x^0), j = 1, 2$, as

$$\tilde{Z}^{1/2\dagger}\mathcal{E}^{matt}_{(F)}(k\downarrow)\tilde{Z}^{1/2} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{E}_1(k\downarrow) & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{E}_2(k\downarrow) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.63}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(k\downarrow; x^0) = \tilde{Z}^{1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\alpha}_1(k\downarrow; x^0) \\ \tilde{\alpha}_2(k\downarrow; x^0) \end{pmatrix} \equiv \tilde{Z}^{1/2}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_M(k\downarrow; x^0) \tag{2.64}$$

with

$$\tilde{Z}^{1/2} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\tilde{\theta} & \sin\tilde{\theta} \\ -\sin\tilde{\theta} & \cos\tilde{\theta} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.65}$$

$$\tilde{\alpha}_j(kj; x^0) = \tilde{\alpha}_j(k\downarrow; 0)\exp(-i\tilde{E}_j(k\downarrow;; x^0). \tag{2.66}$$

We obtain

$$\tan\tilde{\theta} = \frac{\Delta m^2 \sin(2\theta)}{-A + \Delta m^2\cos(2\theta) + \sqrt{(A - \Delta m^2\cos(2\theta))^2 + (\Delta m^2\sin(2\theta))^2}}, \tag{2.67}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sin(2\tilde{\theta}) \\ \cos(2\tilde{\theta}) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(A - \Delta m^2\cos(2\theta))^2 + (\Delta m^2\sin(2\theta))^2}} \begin{pmatrix} \Delta m^2\sin(2\theta) \\ \Delta m^2\cos(2\theta) - A \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.68}$$

Eq.(2.62) is known to lead to a level crossing phenomenon of the two-level problem in quantum mechanics [15,20–22].

From (2.64) or by integrating Heisenberg equation (without $L_{int}(x)$)

$$\begin{aligned} i\frac{d}{dx^0}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(k\downarrow; x^0) &= [\boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(k\downarrow; x^0), \mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(F)}(k\downarrow; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_F)] \\ &= \tilde{Z}^{1/2}\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{E}_1(k\downarrow) & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{E}_2(k\downarrow) \end{pmatrix}\tilde{Z}^{1/2\dagger}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(k\downarrow; x^0). \end{aligned} \tag{2.69}$$

we obtain [18]

$$\alpha_\rho(k\downarrow; x^0) = \sum_{\sigma, j} \tilde{z}^{1/2}_{\rho j}\exp(-i\tilde{E}_j(k\downarrow)(x^0 - x^0_I)) \cdot \tilde{z}^{1/2*}_{\sigma j}\alpha_\sigma(k\downarrow; x^0_I). \tag{2.70}$$

When we define the vacuum $|\tilde{0}\rangle$ as

$$\tilde{\alpha}_\rho(k\downarrow; 0)|\tilde{0}\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for } \forall\vec{k}, \rho, \tag{2.71}$$

and the state

$$\Psi_\rho(k\downarrow; x^0) = \langle\tilde{0}|\alpha_\rho(k\downarrow; x^0), \tag{2.72}$$

we obtain Schrödinger equation corresponding to (2.69) and its integration

$$\Psi_\rho(k\downarrow; x^0) = \sum_{\sigma, j}\tilde{z}^{1/2}_{\rho j}\exp\left[-i\tilde{E}_j(k\downarrow)(x^0 - x^0_I)\right] \cdot \tilde{z}^{1/2*}_{\sigma j}\Psi_\sigma(k\downarrow; x^0_I). \tag{2.73}$$

Then, the transition amplitudes for $\nu_\sigma \to \nu_\rho$ in matter are

$$A^{matt}_{\rho\sigma}(k\downarrow; x^0 - x^0_I) = \sum_j \tilde{z}^{1/2}_{\rho j} \exp\left[-i\tilde{E}_j(k\downarrow)(x^0 - x^0_I)\right] \cdot \tilde{z}^{1/2*}_{\sigma j} \tag{2.74}$$

and their absolute squares lead to the transition probabilities

$$P^{matt}(\nu_e \to \nu_\mu) = \frac{1}{2}\sin^2(2\tilde{\theta})[1 - \cos(\Delta E^{matt} L)] = P^{matt}(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e), \tag{2.75}$$

$$P^{matt}(\nu_e \to \nu_e) = P^{matt}(\nu_\mu \to \nu_\mu) = 1 - P^{matt}(\nu_e \to \nu_\mu); \tag{2.76}$$

here $L = (x^0 - x^0_L)/c$, the approximate distance that neutrino passes in matter;$\Delta E^{matt} = \tilde{m}_2(\downarrow)^2 - \tilde{m}_1(\downarrow)^2$.

In the same procedure, we obtain Hamiltonian for $\boldsymbol{\beta}_F(-k\uparrow; x^0)$ given by

$$\mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(F)}(k\uparrow; \boldsymbol{\beta}_F) = \boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger_F(-k\uparrow; x^0)\mathcal{E}^{matt}_{(F)}(k\uparrow)\boldsymbol{\beta}_F(-k\uparrow; x^0), \tag{2.77}$$

$$\mathcal{E}^{matt}_{(F)}(k\uparrow) = Z^{1/2*}\mathcal{E}^{matt}_{(M)}(k\uparrow)(Z^{1/2})^T, \tag{2.78}$$

where $\mathcal{E}^{matt}_{(M)}(k\uparrow)$ is expressed as RHS of (2.57) with $-\kappa_{jl}$ substituted for κ_{jl}; thus $\mathcal{E}^{matt}_{(F)}(k\uparrow)$ is given by RHS of (2.60) with $-A_0$ and $-A$ instead of A_0 and A.

As pointed out in the preceding subsection B and concerning (2.53), the substitutions (2.54) and (2.55) are problematic approximations. Section IV will be devoted to examining this problem.

III. POLES OF FLAVOR-NEUTRINO PROPAGATOR

We give a remark on the poles of the flavor-neutrino propagator and their relation with the energy eigenvalues obtained in Sec.II.B. Those poles correspond to the physical masses of neutrinos [23]. It has been shown in Ref. [5] concretely in the two- and three-flavor neutrinos in vacuum that the diagonalization of the pole part in the propagator matrix is equivalent to the diagonalization of the mass matrix in Lagrangian in so far as the propagator matrix is evaluated by taking into account fully the repetition of the bilinear (mass-type) interaction and dropping other interactions. This is, as noted in Ref. [5], independent of the ways separating the bilinear interaction part from the free Lagrangian.

Now we consider the neutrino propagation in matter, where the Lagrangian (2.5) is rewritten as

$$L^{matt}_{eff}(x) = -\begin{pmatrix} \bar{\nu}_e & \bar{\nu}_\mu \end{pmatrix}\left[\not{\partial} + \begin{pmatrix} \hat{m}_{ee} & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{m}_{\mu\mu} \end{pmatrix}\right]\begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ \nu_\mu \end{pmatrix} + L_I(x) + L_{int}(x), \tag{3.1}$$

$$L_I(x) = -\begin{pmatrix} \bar{\nu}_e & \bar{\nu}_\mu \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \Delta_{ee} - i(b_0 + b_1)\ \not{u}P_L & m_{e\mu} \\ m_{e\mu} & \Delta_{\mu\mu} - ib_0\ \not{u}P_L) \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ \nu_\mu \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.2}$$

with $\Delta_{\rho\rho} = m_{\rho\rho} - \hat{m}_{\rho\rho}$.

The physical masses of neutrinos are obtained as poles of the propagator $S'_{\sigma\rho}(k)$ of the unrenormalized Heisenberg fields $\nu_\rho(x)$'s;

$$S'_{\sigma\rho}(x - y) = \langle 0|T(\nu_\sigma(x)\bar{\nu}_\rho(y))|0\rangle = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^4}\int d^4k e^{ik(x-y)} S'_{\sigma\rho}(k). \tag{3.3}$$

The Fourier transform $S'_{\sigma\rho}(k)$ satisfies

$$S'_{\sigma\rho}(k) = \delta_{\sigma\rho}S_\rho(k) + \sum_\lambda S'_{\sigma\lambda}(k)\Pi_{\lambda\rho}(k)S_\rho(k); \tag{3.4}$$

here, $\Pi_{\lambda\rho}(k)$ and $S_\rho(k)$ are the proper self-energy part and the Fourier transform of the free propagator when the first part in RHS of (3.1) is regarded as the free Lagrangian. Then $S_\rho(k)$ is expressed as

$$S_\rho(k) = \frac{-\not{k} - i\hat{m}_{\rho\rho}}{k^2 + \hat{m}^2_{\rho\rho} - i\epsilon}. \tag{3.5}$$

We neglect $L_{int}(x)$ which is taken not to include any bilinear terms of the flavor neutrino fields, and the repetition of $L_I(x)$ is fully taken into account; then we obtain (by assuming the x-independence of b_0 and b_1)

$$[\Pi_{\sigma\rho}(k)] = -i \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_{ee} - i(b_0+b_1)\ \not{u}P_L & m_{e\mu} \\ m_{e\mu} & \Delta_{\mu\mu} - ib_0\ \not{u}P_L \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.6}$$

When we define the matrix $[f_{\sigma\rho}(k)]$ to be

$$S'_{\sigma\rho}(k) = [f(k)^{-1}]_{\sigma\rho}, \tag{3.7}$$

we obtain from (3.4)

$$f_{\sigma\rho}(k) = \delta_{\sigma\rho} S_\sigma(k)^{-1} - \Pi_{\sigma\rho}(k), \tag{3.8}$$

the concrete form of which is

$$[f_{\sigma\rho}(k)] = \begin{pmatrix} -\ \not{k} + i\{m_{ee} - i(b_0+b_1)\ \not{u}P_L\} & im_{e\mu} \\ im_{e\mu} & -\ \not{k} + i\{m_{\mu\mu} - ib_0\ \not{u}P_L\} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.9}$$

or

$$\frac{1}{i}[f_{\sigma\rho}(k)] = \begin{pmatrix} m_{ee} & -(\vec{\sigma}\vec{k}+k_0)+N & m_{e\mu} & 0 \\ \vec{\sigma}\vec{k}-k_0 & m_{ee} & 0 & m_{e\mu} \\ m_{e\mu} & 0 & m_{\mu\mu} & -(\vec{\sigma}\vec{k}+k_0)+N' \\ 0 & m_{e\mu} & \vec{\sigma}\vec{k}-k_0 & m_{\mu\mu} \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.10}$$

where N and N' are defined in (2.6). We see that, as expected, $[f_{\sigma\rho}(k)]$ is free from the arbitrariness of separating L_I in L_{eff}^{matt}.

In the same way, from Lagrangian (2.15) expressed in terms of the mass-basis operators, we can define $S'_{jl}(k)$ which is the Fourier transform of

$$S'_{jl}(x-y) = \langle 0|T(\nu_j(x)\bar{\nu}_l(y))|0\rangle \tag{3.11}$$

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{i}[f_{jl}^{(m)}(k)] &\equiv \frac{1}{i}[(S'(k)^{-1})_{jl}] \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & -(\vec{\sigma}\vec{k}+k_0)+B & 0 & G \\ \vec{\sigma}\vec{k}-k_0 & m_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & G & m_2 & -(\vec{\sigma}\vec{k}+k_0)+B' \\ 0 & 0 & \vec{\sigma}\vec{k}-k_0 & m_2 \end{pmatrix}; \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

here B, B' and G are defined in (2.16). We can confirm concretely the relation between (3.10) and (3.12)

$$[f_{jl}^{(m)}(k)] = Z^{1/2\dagger}[f_{\sigma\rho}(k)]Z^{1/2} \quad , \quad Z^{1/2} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & \sin\theta \\ -\sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.13}$$

expected from $\nu_\rho(x) = \sum_j z_{\rho j}^{1/2}\nu_j(x)$.

Next we examine the poles of the propagator $S'(k)$, which are given by $\det[f_{\sigma\rho}(k)] = \det[f_{jl}^{(m)}(k)] = 0$. It is useful for us to note that, for a matrix $\begin{pmatrix} a & c \\ d & b \end{pmatrix}$ with square sub-matrices a, b, c and d, we have

$$\det\begin{pmatrix} a & c \\ d & b \end{pmatrix} = \left| \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ d & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & a^{-1}c \\ 0 & b - da^{-1}c \end{pmatrix} \right|, \tag{3.14}$$

which is equal to $|ab - dc|$ if $[a^{-1}, d] = 0$. [2] We obtain

---

[2] Note that

$$det\left[\frac{1}{i}f_{jl}^{m}(k)\right] = det\begin{pmatrix} m_1 & 0 & -(\vec{\sigma}\vec{k}+k_0)+B & G \\ 0 & m_2 & G & -(\vec{\sigma}\vec{k}+k_0)+B' \\ \vec{\sigma}\vec{k}-k_0 & 0 & m_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \vec{\sigma}\vec{k}-k_0 & 0 & m_2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.15}$$

$$\det[\frac{1}{i}f^{(m)}_{jl}(k)] = K_1^2K_2^2 + 2K_1K_2\{(K_1\kappa_{22}+K_2\kappa_{11})(\vec{k}\vec{u}-k_0u_0) + (\det\kappa)[2(\vec{k}\vec{u}-k_0u_0)^2 - k_0^2 + \vec{k}^2]\}$$
$$+(k_0^2-\vec{k}^2)\{(K_1\kappa_{22}+K_2\kappa_{11})^2 + 2(K_1\kappa_{22}+K_2\kappa_{11})(\det\kappa)(\vec{k}\vec{u}-k_0u_0) + (\det\kappa)^2(k_0^2-\vec{k}^2)\}, \quad (3.16)$$

where $K_j = k_0^2 - (\vec{k}^2 + m_j^2) = k_0^2 - \omega_j^2$. RHS of (3.16) is divided into two parts, one of which vanishes in the static medium:

$$(3.16) = \Big[K_1^2K_2^2 + 2K_1K_2\{-k_0(K_1\kappa_{22}+K_2\kappa_{11}) + (\det\kappa)(k_0^2+\vec{k}^2)\}$$
$$+(k_0^2-\vec{k}^2)\Big\{(K_1\kappa_{22}+K_2\kappa_{11})^2 - 2k_0(\det\kappa)(K_1\kappa_{22}+K_2\kappa_{11}) + (\det\kappa)^2(k_0^2-\vec{k}^2)\Big\}\Big]$$
$$+\Big[2K_1K_2\Big\{(K_1\kappa_{22}+K_2\kappa_{11})(\vec{k}\vec{u}-k_0u_0+k_0) + 2(\det\kappa)[(\vec{k}\vec{u}-k_0u_0)^2 - k_0^2]\Big\}$$
$$+2(k_0^2-\vec{k}^2)(K_1\kappa_{22}+K_2\kappa_{11})(\det\kappa)(\vec{k}\vec{u}-k_0u_0+k_0)\Big]. \quad (3.17)$$

Thus we have

$$Det(k)_{static} \equiv \det[\frac{1}{i}f^{(m)}_{jl}(k)]_{static} = \det[\frac{1}{i}f_{\sigma\rho}(k)]_{static}$$
$$= \Big[(k_0^2-\omega_1^2)(k_0^2-\omega_2^2) - (k_0-|\vec{k}|)\Big\{(k_0^2-\omega_1^2)\kappa_{22} + (k_0^2-\omega_2^2)\kappa_{11} - (k_0-|\vec{k}|)(\det\kappa)\Big\}\Big]$$
$$\times\Big[(k_0^2-\omega_1^2)(k_0^2-\omega_2^2) - (k_0+|\vec{k}|)\Big\{(k_0^2-\omega_1^2)\kappa_{22} + (k_0^2-\omega_2^2)\kappa_{11} - (k_0+|\vec{k}|)(\det\kappa)\Big\}\Big]. \quad (3.18)$$

We see that the two parts composing $Det(|\vec{k}|, k_0=\lambda)_{static}$ are equal to (2.30) and (2.31), respectively, i.e.

$$Det(|\vec{k}|, k_0=\lambda)_{static} = \det[(H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\uparrow)-\lambda)(H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow)-\lambda)] \quad (3.19)$$

This is a natural equality in the present approximation of neglecting $L_{int}(x)$ contribution, since $\mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(M)}(x^0)$ in the static medium is separated into helicity-up and -down parts like (2.24).

IV. ENERGY-EIGENVECTORS IN MATTER

We investigate the eigenvectors of $H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow)$ and $H^{matt}_{(F)}(k\downarrow)$ corresponding to the eigenvalues in the extreme-relativistic case obtained in Appendix B. For convenience, we write these eigenvalues as

$$E_a(k\downarrow) \equiv k + \frac{\tilde{m}_{(+)a}(\downarrow)^2}{2k}, \quad (4.1)$$

$$E_{a+2}(k\downarrow) \equiv -(k + \frac{\tilde{m}_{(-)a}(\downarrow)^2}{2k}), \ \ a=1,2., \quad (4.2)$$

Here we give a concrete form of $H^{matt}_{(F)}(k\downarrow)$in the flavor basis; this is obtained by utilizing (2.25) and

$$H^{matt}_{(F)}(k\downarrow) = \mathcal{K}(k)H^{matt}_{(M)}(k)\mathcal{K}(k\downarrow)^\dagger, \quad (4.3)$$

derived from (2.25) and (2.51);

$$H^{matt}_{(F)}(k\downarrow) = \quad (4.4)$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_e + \frac{\mu_e(m_{ee}-\mu_e)}{\omega_e} + Nc_ec_e & m_{e\mu}\sin\frac{\chi_e+\chi_\mu}{2} & i\frac{k(m_{ee}-\mu_e)}{\omega_e} - ic_es_eN & im_{e\mu}\cos\frac{\chi_e+\chi_\mu}{2} \\ m_{e\mu}\sin\frac{\chi_e+\chi_\mu}{2} & \omega_\mu + \frac{\mu_\mu(m_{\mu\mu}-\mu_\mu)}{\omega_\mu} + N'c_\mu c_\mu & im_{e\mu}\cos\frac{\chi_e+\chi_\mu}{2} & i\frac{k(m_{\mu\mu}-\mu_\mu)}{\omega_\mu} - ic_\mu s_\mu N' \\ -i\frac{k(m_{ee}-\mu_e)}{\omega_e} + iNs_ec_e & -im_{e\mu}\cos\frac{\chi_e+\chi_\mu}{2} & -\omega_e - \frac{\mu_e(m_{ee}-\mu_e)}{\omega_e} + Ns_es_e & -m_{e\mu}\sin\frac{\chi_e+\chi_\mu}{2} \\ -im_{e\mu}\cos\frac{\chi_e+\chi_\mu}{2} & -i\frac{k(m_{\mu\mu}-\mu_\mu)}{\omega_\mu} + iN's_\mu c_\mu & -m_{e\mu}\sin\frac{\chi_e+\chi_\mu}{2} & -\omega_\mu - \frac{\mu_\mu(m_{\mu\mu}-\mu_\mu)}{\omega_\mu} + N's_\mu s_\mu \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\omega_\rho = \sqrt{k^2+\mu_\rho^2}$, $s_\rho = \sin(\chi_\rho/2)$, $c_\rho = \cos(\chi_\rho/2)$, $\cot\chi_\rho = k/\mu_\rho$, $N = b_0 + b_1$, $N' = b_0$. Thus we see that the eigenvectors of $H^{matt}_{(F)}(k\downarrow)$ do depend generally on a set of arbitrary mass parameters $\{\mu_e, \mu_\mu\}$. We will examine this situation.

A. general relations

Let us define a set of the eigenvectors as

$$H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow)\boldsymbol{y}^{(a)}_M = E_a(k\downarrow)\boldsymbol{y}^{(a)}_M, \tag{4.5}$$

$$H^{matt}_{(F)}(k\downarrow)\boldsymbol{y}^{(a)}_F = E_a(k\downarrow)\boldsymbol{y}^{(a)}_F \quad , \quad a=1,2,3,4; \tag{4.6}$$

here, we take these eigenvectors so as to satisfy the ortho-normality condition

$$\boldsymbol{y}^{(a)\dagger}_M\boldsymbol{y}^{(b)}_M = \delta_{ab}\,, \quad \boldsymbol{y}^{(a)\dagger}_F\boldsymbol{y}^{(b)}_F = \delta_{ab}, \tag{4.7}$$

and to have the relation

$$\boldsymbol{y}^{(a)}_F = \mathcal{K}(k)\boldsymbol{y}^{(a)}_M. \tag{4.8}$$

By defining the unitary matrices

$$T_{(M)}(k) \equiv \left(\begin{array}{cccc} \boldsymbol{y}^{(1)}_M & \boldsymbol{y}^{(2)}_M & \boldsymbol{y}^{(3)}_M & \boldsymbol{y}^{(4)}_M \end{array}\right), \tag{4.9}$$

$$T_{(F)}(k) \equiv \left(\begin{array}{cccc} \boldsymbol{y}^{(1)}_F & \boldsymbol{y}^{(2)}_F & \boldsymbol{y}^{(3)}_F & \boldsymbol{y}^{(4)}_F \end{array}\right) = \mathcal{K}(k)T_{(M)}(k), \tag{4.10}$$

we have

$$T^\dagger_{(M)}(k)H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow)T_{(M)}(k) = \begin{pmatrix} E_1(k\downarrow) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & E_2(k\downarrow) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & E_3(k\downarrow) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & E_4(k\downarrow) \end{pmatrix} \equiv E^{matt}_{diag}(k\downarrow); \tag{4.11}$$

thus, from (2.25),

$$\mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow;x^0) = \left(\begin{array}{cc} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\dagger_M(k\downarrow;x^0) & \boldsymbol{\beta}_M(-k\downarrow;x^0) \end{array}\right) T_{(M)}(k)E^{matt}_{diag}(k\downarrow)T^\dagger_{(M)}(k)\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_M(k\downarrow;x^0) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger_M(-k\downarrow;x^0) \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.12}$$

Here, for convenience, we redefine $H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow;x^0)$ by adding an appropriate c-number so that the normal ordering symbol : : is dropped. The above expression is rewritten as

$$\text{RHS of (4.12)} = \left(\begin{array}{cc} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\dagger_F(k\downarrow;x^0) & \boldsymbol{\beta}_F(-k\downarrow;x^0) \end{array}\right) T_{(F)}(k)E^{matt}_{diag}(k\downarrow)T^\dagger_{(F)}(k)\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(k\downarrow;x^0) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger_F(-k\downarrow;x^0) \end{pmatrix} \equiv \mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(F)}(k\downarrow;x^0), \tag{4.13}$$

which is the Hamiltonian in the flavor basis.

Corresponding to (2.64), we define renewdly the operators (with $a=1,2$):

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_a(k\downarrow;x^0) \equiv \boldsymbol{y}^{(a)}_F(k)^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(k\downarrow;x^0) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger_F(-k\downarrow;x^0) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.14}$$

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\dagger_a(-k\downarrow;x^0) \equiv \boldsymbol{y}^{(a+2)}_F(k)^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(k\downarrow;x^0) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger_F(-k\downarrow;x^0) \end{pmatrix}; \tag{4.15}$$

then we write them as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_M(k\downarrow;x^0) \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\dagger_M(-k\downarrow;x^0) \end{pmatrix} = T^\dagger_{(F)}\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(k\downarrow;x^0) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger_F(-k\downarrow;x^0) \end{pmatrix} = T^\dagger_{(M)}\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_M(k\downarrow;x^0) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger_M(-k\downarrow;x^0) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.16}$$

and Hamiltonian (4.12) (or (4.13)) is expressed in terms of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_M(k\downarrow;x^0)$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_M(-k\downarrow;x^0)$ as

$$\mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow;x^0) = \mathcal{H}^{matt}_{(F)}(k\downarrow;x^0) = \left(\begin{array}{cc} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^\dagger_M(k\downarrow;x^0) & \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_M(-k\downarrow;x^0) \end{array}\right) E^{matt}_{diag}(k\downarrow)\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_M(k\downarrow;x^0) \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\dagger_M(-k\downarrow;x^0) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.17}$$

By noting that

$$\tilde{\alpha}_a(k\downarrow;x^0) = e^{-iE_a(k\downarrow)x^0}\tilde{\alpha}_a(k\downarrow;0),$$
$$\tilde{\beta}_a(-k\downarrow;x^0) = e^{iE_{a+2}(k\downarrow)x^0}\tilde{\beta}_a(-k\downarrow;0) \tag{4.18}$$

we see that (4.17) is time-independent; then we write it as

$$\mathcal{H}^{matt}(k\downarrow) = \left(\,\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_M^\dagger(k\downarrow)\ \ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_M(-k\downarrow)\,\right) E^{matt}_{diag}(k\downarrow) \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_M(k\downarrow) \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_M^\dagger(-k\downarrow) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.19}$$

where

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_M(k\downarrow) \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_M^\dagger(-k\downarrow) \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_M(k\downarrow;0) \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_M^\dagger(-k\downarrow;0) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.20}$$

Now we consider Heisenberg equation

$$i\frac{d}{dx^0}\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(k\downarrow;x^0) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_F^\dagger(-k\downarrow;x^0) \end{pmatrix} = [\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(k\downarrow;x^0) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_F^\dagger(-k\downarrow;x^0) \end{pmatrix}, \text{Eq.(4.13)}] = H^{matt}_{(F)}(k\downarrow)\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(k\downarrow;x^0) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_F^\dagger(-k\downarrow;x^0) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.21}$$

where

$$H^{matt}_{(F)}(k\downarrow) = T_{(F)}(k)E^{matt}_{diag}(k\downarrow)T^\dagger_{(F)}(k). \tag{4.22}$$

By defining the vacuum $|\tilde{0}\rangle$ as

$$\left\{\begin{array}{c} \tilde{\alpha}_a(k\downarrow;x^0) \\ \tilde{\beta}_a(-k\downarrow;x^0) \end{array}\right\}|\tilde{0}\rangle = 0 \qquad \text{for} \qquad \forall\vec{k}, a, x_0 \tag{4.23}$$

and

$$\Psi_\rho(k\downarrow;x^0) \equiv \langle\tilde{0}|\alpha_\rho(k\downarrow;x^0), \tag{4.24}$$

it may be possible for us, similarly to the explanation in Sec.II.C, to investigate the evolution relations. There will appears, however, a certain new aspect different from the simple relation (2.70): Even in the approximation framework of the extreme-relativistic case employed for obtaining the energy eigenvalues of $H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow)$, the matrix $T_{(F)}(k)$ giving a sort of evolution relation

$$\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(k\downarrow;x^0) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_F^\dagger(-k\downarrow;x^0) \end{pmatrix} = T_{(F)}(k)\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_M(k\downarrow;x^0) \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_M^\dagger(-k\downarrow;x^0) \end{pmatrix} = W^{(F)}(k\downarrow;x^0-x^0_I)^\dagger\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(k\downarrow;x^0_I) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_F^\dagger(-k\downarrow;x^0_I) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.25}$$
$$W^{(F)}(k\downarrow;x^0-x^0_I) \equiv T_{(F)}(k)\Phi(k;x^0-x^0_I)T^\dagger_{(F)}(k), \tag{4.26}$$
$$\Phi(k;x^0) \equiv \exp(iE^{matt}_{diag}(k\downarrow)x^0), \tag{4.27}$$

not only depends on the arbitrary mass parameters μ_λ but also has *off-diagonal* elements connecting $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_M(k\downarrow;x^0)$ to $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_M^\dagger(-k\downarrow;x^0)$. In the following subsection we examine such a situation concretely.

B. Approximate forms of eigenvectors

By employing (2.27) , Eq.(4.5) for $a=1$ case is explicitly written as

$$\frac{1}{2k}\begin{pmatrix} m_1^2-\tilde{m}_{(+)1}(\downarrow)^2+(A_0+Ac_\theta^2)c_1c_1 & Ac_\theta s_\theta c_1c_2 & -i(A_0+Ac_\theta^2)c_1s_1 & -iAc_\theta s_\theta c_1s_2 \\ Ac_\theta s_\theta c_2c_1 & m_2^2-\tilde{m}_{(+)1}(\downarrow)^2+(A_0+As_\theta^2)c_2c_2 & -iAc_\theta s_\theta c_2s_1 & -i(A_0+As_\theta^2)c_2s_2 \\ i(A_0+Ac_\theta^2)s_1c_1 & iAc_\theta s_\theta s_1c_2 & -4k^2-m_1^2-\tilde{m}_{(+)1}(\downarrow)^2+(A_0+Ac_\theta^2)s_1s_1 & Ac_\theta s_\theta s_1s_2 \\ iAc_\theta s_\theta s_2c_1 & i(A_0+As_\theta^2)s_2c_2 & Ac_\theta s_\theta s_2s_1 & -4k^2-m_2^2-\tilde{m}_{(+)1}(\downarrow)^2+(A_0+As_\theta^2)s_2s_2 \end{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{y}_M^{(1)} = 0. \tag{4.28}$$

In the extreme-relativistic case, we see from the third and the forth equations that

$$y^{(1)}_{M,3},\ y^{(1)}_{M,4} = \mathcal{O}(1/k^n) \quad , \quad n \geq 3 \tag{4.29}$$

in comparison with 1. Then, from the first and the second equations of (4.28) we obtain, by dropping $O(1/k^2)$-corrections to the masses

$$\begin{pmatrix} m_1^2 - \tilde{m}_{(+)1}(\downarrow)^2 + A_0 + Ac_\theta^2 & Ac_\theta s_\theta \\ Ac_\theta s_\theta & m_2^2 - \tilde{m}_{(+)1}(\downarrow)^2 + A_0 + As_\theta^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} y^{(1)}_{M,1} \\ y^{(1)}_{M,2} \end{pmatrix} = 0. \tag{4.30}$$

The condition for the matrix on LHS to be consistent with $|y^{(1)}_{M,1}|^2 + |y^{(1)}_{M,2}|^2 = 1$ is its determinant to be equal to 0. This condition is seen to be satisfied, because, due to (B12) , the determinant is written as

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{4}\Big\{-\Delta m^2 + A\cos(2\theta) + \sqrt{(A\cos(2\theta) - \Delta m^2)^2 + (A\sin(2\theta))^2}\Big\} \\ &\times\Big\{\Delta m^2 - A\cos(2\theta) + \sqrt{(A\cos(2\theta) - \Delta m^2)^2 + (A\sin(2\theta))^2}\Big\} - (\frac{1}{2}A\sin(2\theta))^2 = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

As for the vector $\boldsymbol{y}^{(2)}_M$, we see that, due to the condition with $(-)$ sign substituted for the sign $(+)$ in front of the square root in (4.31), the solution

$$y^{(2)}_{M,3},\ y^{(2)}_{M,4} = \mathcal{O}(1/k^n) \quad , \quad n \geq 3, \qquad |y^{(2)}_{M,1}|^2 + |y^{(2)}_{M,2}|^2 = 1 \tag{4.32}$$

is obtained.

As for $\boldsymbol{y}^{(3)}_M$ and $\boldsymbol{y}^{(4)}_M$, possible solutions are seen to exist: for $n \geq 2$

$$y^{(3)}_{M,3} = \mathcal{O}(k^0) \quad ; \quad y^{(3)}_{M,1}, y^{(3)}_{M,2} = \mathcal{O}(1/k^{n+1}) \quad ; \quad y^{(3)}_{M,4} = \mathcal{O}(1/k^n), \tag{4.33}$$

$$y^{(4)}_{M,3} = \mathcal{O}(k^0) \quad ; \quad y^{(4)}_{M,1}, y^{(4)}_{M,2} = \mathcal{O}(1/k^{n+1}) \quad ; \quad y^{(4)}_{M,3} = \mathcal{O}(1/k^n). \tag{4.34}$$

As a result, under the approximation conditions of the extreme-relativistic case, we are allowed to take the matrix form of $T_{(M)}$, defined by (4.9), to be

$$T_{(M)}(k) = \begin{pmatrix} t_{(M)}(k) & 0 \\ 0 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad t_{(M)}(k) = \begin{pmatrix} y^{(1)}_1(k) & y^{(2)}_1(k) \\ y^{(1)}_2(k) & y^{(2)}_2(k) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.35}$$

$$\frac{y^{(1)}_1(k)}{y^{(1)}_2(k)} = \frac{-A\sin(2\theta)}{-\Delta m^2 + A\cos(2\theta) + \sqrt{(A\cos(2\theta) - \Delta m^2)^2 + (A\sin(2\theta))^2}}, \tag{4.36}$$

$$\frac{y^{(2)}_1(k)}{y^{(2)}_2(k)} = \frac{-A\sin(2\theta)}{-\Delta m^2 + A\cos(2\theta) - \sqrt{(A\cos(2\theta) - \Delta m^2)^2 + (A\sin(2\theta))^2}} \tag{4.37}$$

with the unitarity condition $t^\dagger_{(M)} t_{(M)} = I$.

Thus the relation of $\{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_M(k \downarrow; x^0), \boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger_M(-k \downarrow; x^0)\}$ with $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_M(k \downarrow; x^0), \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\dagger_M(-k \downarrow; x^0)\}$, given by (4.16), becomes rather simple:

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}_M(k \downarrow; x^0) = t_M(k)\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_M(k \downarrow; x^0), \tag{4.38}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger_M(-k \downarrow; x^0) = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\dagger_M(-k \downarrow; x^0). \tag{4.39}$$

On the other hand, the corresponding relation for $\{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_F, \boldsymbol{\beta}_F\}$ includes the Bogolyubov transformation:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(k \downarrow; x^0) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger_F(-k \downarrow; x^0) \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{K}(k) \begin{pmatrix} t_M(k)\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_M(k \downarrow; x^0) \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\dagger_M(-k \downarrow; x^0) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.40}$$

Under the approximation of the extreme-relativistic case, the *off-diagonal* submatrix of $\mathcal{K}(k)$, i.e. $i\Lambda = i[z^{1/2}_{\rho j}\lambda_{\rho j}(k)]$ can not be set equal to zero, because $\lambda_{\rho j}(k) = \sin((\chi_\rho - \chi_j)/2)$ depends on $\{\mu_\lambda\}$; in other words, since (2.53) has no logical basis, we are not allowed to take (2.55). Therefore, contrary to Ref. [1], we can not derive the standard relations including the oscillation formulas explained in Sec.II.C.

Finally, we add a remark on Ref. [1]. When we write $t_{(M)}(k)$ as

$$t_M(k) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta_M & \sin\theta_M \\ -\sin\theta_M & \cos\theta_M \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.41}$$

we have from (4.30) (or from (4.36) and (4.37))

$$\tan\theta_M = \frac{m_1^2 - \tilde{m}_{(+)1}(\downarrow)^2 + A_0 + A\cos^2\theta_\theta}{A\cos\theta\sin\theta}. \tag{4.42}$$

This is equal to Eq.(2.25) in Ref. [1] for $m_A^2 = \tilde{m}_{(+)1}(\downarrow)^2$ and $A_0 = 0$. As noted in Sec.II.C, the usually employed relations are derived if we take the super-relativistic limit (2.54) and (2.55). In this limit, $\mathcal{K}(k)$ reduces to

$$\mathcal{K}(k) \longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} Z^{1/2} & 0 \\ 0 & Z^{1/2} \end{pmatrix}; \tag{4.43}$$

(4.40) leads to

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(k\downarrow; x^0) = Z^{1/2} t_M(k) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_M(k\downarrow; x^0) \tag{4.44}$$

with

$$Z^{1/2} t_M(k) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta+\theta_M) & \sin(\theta+\theta_M) \\ -\sin(\theta+\theta_M) & \cos(\theta+\theta_M); \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.45}$$

(4.45) should be equal to (2.65), i.e.

$$Z^{1/2} t_M(k) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\tilde{\theta} & \sin\tilde{\theta} \\ -\sin\tilde{\theta} & \cos\tilde{\theta} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.46}$$

By employing (4.36)$= -1/\tan\theta_M$ (or (4.37) $= \tan\theta_M$) as well as $\tan\tilde{\theta}$ given by (2.67), we can confirm the equality (4.46) to hold. As to the oscillation formulas, we obtain (2.75) and(2.76); by using (2.68), (2.75) is rewritten as

$$P^{matt}(\nu_e \to \nu_\mu) = \frac{(\Delta m^2 \sin(2\theta))^2 \sin^2(\Delta E^{matt} L/2)}{(A - \Delta m^2\cos(2\theta))^2 + (\Delta m^2 \sin(2\theta))^2}, \tag{4.47}$$

which is equal to Eq.(2.35) in Ref. [1].

It is asserted in Ref. [1] that the standard formalism of neutrino oscillation in matter is derived from the field theoretical approach. This assertion, however, is based on the approximation (4.43) which is not allowed when the relativistic approximation is consistently performed.

V. CONCLUSION AND FINAL REMARKS

We have investigated in detail the connection of the operatorial field mixing relations $\nu_\rho(x) = \sum_j z_{\rho j}^{1/2} \nu_j(x)$ with the usually employed formulas of neutrino oscillations in matter. To this aim, we first derived the energy-eigenvalue equations for the 2-flavor neutrinos in the static medium with the (x^ρ)-independent electron density.

We examined the high-energy neutrino case, called *the extreme-relativistic case*, defined by (2.35), where all terms with higher order than $\{m_j^2, A, A_0\}/k^2$ in comparison with 1 are neglected and corrections to terms such as m_j^2 and $k\kappa_{jl}$ are dropped. After performing consistently this approximation, we obtained the energy eigenvalues which coincide with the usual ones obtained in the quantum mechanical approach [18] as well as in the field theoretical one by Mannheim [1].

As for the evolution relations, however, we obtained a negative result against Mannheim's assertion that the standard formalism of the neutrino oscillation is derived in the field theoretical approach. The reason for such a difference has been pointed out in Sec.V: while the relation (4.40) in our case, i.e.

$$\alpha_\rho(k\downarrow; x^0) = \sum_j \left\{ \mathcal{K}(k)_{\rho j} (t_{(M)} \tilde{\alpha}_M(k\downarrow; x^0))_j + \mathcal{K}(k)_{\rho \bar{j}} \tilde{\beta}_j^\dagger(-k\downarrow; x^0) \right\}, \tag{5.1}$$

is (consistently) obtained, in Mannheim's case [1] the relation (4.44), i.e.

$$\alpha_\rho(k\downarrow;x^0)=\sum_j z_{\rho j}^{1/2}(t_{(M)}\tilde{\alpha}_M(k\downarrow;x^0))_j, \tag{5.2}$$

is utilized. Eq.(5.2) is obtained from (5.1) by performing (2.55)

$$\rho_{\rho j}\longrightarrow 1\quad,\quad \lambda_{\rho j}\longrightarrow 0\quad,\qquad \forall\rho,j; \tag{5.3}$$

then the Bogolyubov transformation (2.51) reduces to

$$\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(kr;x^0)\\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_F^\dagger(-kr;x^0)\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}z^{1/2} & 0\\ 0 & z^{1/2}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_M(kr;x^0)\\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_M^\dagger(-kr;x^0)\end{pmatrix} \tag{5.4}$$

where the most characteristic feature of the field theory of mixed fields [4–6] has been lost. As already stressed in Sec.V, $\rho_{\rho j}$ and $\lambda_{\rho j}$ depend on the arbitrary parameters $\{\mu_\lambda\}$, and the limit (5.3) has no connection with the approximation in *the extreme-relativistic case* (2.35) with (2.36).

When the electron density in medium $n_{(e)}$ is taken to be 0, i.e. $A_0\to 0, A\to 0$, various relations in medium reduce to those in vacuum. It is worth to remember that, although our considerations have been done for the 2-flavor case, the results obtained have qualitatively general features which hold true for the many flavors case both in matter and in vacuum.

Regarding the calculation of neutrino oscillations in quantum field theory, there are several possible approaches [2,3,8,13], in which transition amplitudes for a finite time interval or finite distance are calculated on the basis of the field theory by treating the neutrinos as particles in intermediate states and without constructing any one-particle state with definite flavor. In the line of the considerations developed in the present paper, it seems meaningful for us to investigate further the implications of the relation (4.25) . This is a kind of evolution relation corresponding to the usual one given by (2.70), and the matrix $W^{(F)}(k\downarrow;x^0)$, corresponding to the usual transition amplitudes (2.74), is an extension of $W(k;x^0)$ introduced in Ref. [10] in the vacuum case. It has been pointed out [10] that

$$W(k;x^0)=\begin{pmatrix}(W_{\rho\sigma}(k;x^0)) & (W_{\rho\bar{\sigma}}(k;x^0))\\ (W_{\bar{\rho}\sigma}(k;x^0)) & (W_{\bar{\rho}\bar{\sigma}}(k;x^0))\end{pmatrix} \tag{5.5}$$

has an intimate connection with the momentum components of the retarded propagators or the anticommutators of the flavor neutrino fields as well as with the expectation value of the flavor charges [7]. The combinations

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\left\{|(W_{\rho\sigma}(k;x^0))|^2+|(W_{\rho\bar{\sigma}}(k;x^0))|^2+|(W_{\bar{\rho}\sigma}(k;x^0))|^2+|(W_{\bar{\rho}\bar{\sigma}}(k;x^0))|^2\right\} \tag{5.6}$$

are independent of $\{\mu_\lambda\}$ for $\forall\rho,\sigma$, and have properties allowing a probability interpretation. $W^{(F)}(k\downarrow;x^0)$ is also seen to satisfy the above properties. In a subsequent paper [24] we will investigate a possible field theoretical approach to the neutrino oscillation, where possible implications of the matrices $W(k;x^0)$ and $W^{(F)}(k\downarrow;x^0)$ to the oscillation formula are considered.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to express their thanks to Prof. G.Vitiello, the organizer of International Workshop on the Quantum Field Theory of Particle mixing and Oscillations, 13-15 June 2002, Vietri sul Mare (Salerno), where the main content of the present paper was report, and also to the participants in that workshop for discussions, especially to Dr. C.Y.Cardall for his calling attention to the Mannheim's paper. M.B. thanks the ESF network COSLAB and EPSRC for support.

APPENDIX A: MOMENTUM-HELICITY EIGENFUNCTIONS

Explicit forms of the momentum-helicity eigenfunctions satisfying

$$(i\not{k}+m)u(kr)=0\,,\quad (-i\not{k}+m)v(kr)=0 \tag{A1}$$

are given in the Kramers representation ($\vec{\gamma}=-\rho_y\otimes\vec{\sigma},\gamma^4=\rho_x\otimes I,\ \gamma_5=\gamma^1\gamma^2\gamma^3\gamma^4=-\rho_z\otimes I$) [16] by

$$u(k\uparrow)=\begin{pmatrix} c\alpha \\ c\beta \\ s\alpha \\ s\beta \end{pmatrix},\ u(k\downarrow)=\begin{pmatrix} -s\beta^* \\ s\alpha^* \\ -c\beta^* \\ c\alpha^* \end{pmatrix},\ v(k\uparrow)=\begin{pmatrix} s\beta^* \\ -s\alpha^* \\ -c\beta^* \\ c\alpha^* \end{pmatrix},\ v(k\downarrow)=\begin{pmatrix} c\alpha \\ c\beta \\ -s\alpha \\ -s\beta \end{pmatrix}, \tag{A2}$$

where

$$\begin{gathered} c=\cos(\chi/2) \quad , \quad s=\sin(\chi/2) \quad , \quad cot\chi=|\vec{k}|/m, k_z=|\vec{k}|\cos\vartheta \quad , \quad k_x+ik_y=|\vec{k}|\sin\vartheta e^{i\phi}, \\ \alpha=\cos(\vartheta/2)e^{-i\phi/2} \quad , \quad \beta=\sin(\vartheta/2)e^{i\phi/2}; \end{gathered} \tag{A3}$$

for $\vec{s}=(I\otimes\vec{\sigma})/2$ and $\hat{\vec{k}}=\vec{k}/|\vec{k}|$, we have

$$(\vec{s}\hat{\vec{k}})u(kr)=\pm\frac{1}{2}u(kr)\,,\quad (\vec{s}\hat{\vec{k}})v(-kr)=\pm\frac{1}{2}v(-kr) \quad \text{for} \quad r=\left\{\begin{matrix} \uparrow \\ \downarrow \end{matrix}\right\}. \tag{A4}$$

Here, $v(-kr)$ is defined by

$$v(-kr)\equiv v(-\vec{k},k^0,r). \tag{A5}$$

Noting $\alpha(-\vec{k})=-i\beta^*, \beta(-\vec{k})=i\alpha^*$, we have

$$v(-k\downarrow)=i\begin{pmatrix} -s\alpha \\ -s\beta \\ c\alpha \\ c\beta \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad v(-k\uparrow)=i\begin{pmatrix} -c\beta^* \\ c\alpha^* \\ s\beta^* \\ -s\alpha^* \end{pmatrix}. \tag{A6}$$

We write the solution of Eq.(A1) with mass m as $u_j(kr)$ and $v_j(kr)$. Then we have

$$\begin{gathered} u_j^*(kr)u_l(ks)=v_j^*(-kr)v_l(-ks)=\rho_{jl}(k)\delta_{rs}, \\ u_j^*(kr)v_l(-ks)=v_j^*(-kr)u_l(ks)=i\lambda_{jl}(k)\delta_{rs}, \end{gathered} \tag{A7}$$

where $\rho_{jl}(k)=\cos[(\chi_j-\chi_l)/2], \lambda_{jl}(k)=\sin[(\chi_j-\chi_l)/2]$ with $cot\chi_j=|\vec{k}|/m_j$. Further we have

$$\sum_r\{u(kr)u^*(kr)+v(-kr)v^*(-kr)\}=I^{(4)}. \tag{A8}$$

($I^{(4)}$ is the 4×4 unit matrix.)

Utilizing the concrete forms of $u(kr)$ and $v(kr)$, we obtain Table I, where $P_L=(1+\gamma_5)/2$, $s_j\equiv\sin(\chi_j/2), c_j\equiv\cos(\chi_j/2), cot\chi_j=|\vec{k}|/m_j$. Further, we obtain (by writing $2\vec{s}=\vec{\sigma}$)

$$\begin{aligned} u_j^\dagger(kr)(\vec{\sigma}\vec{u})P_Lu_l(kr) &= u_j^\dagger(kr)\frac{1}{2}\{(\vec{\sigma}\vec{u}),(\vec{\sigma}\hat{\vec{k}})\}P_Lu_l(kr)\left\{\begin{matrix} +1 \\ -1 \end{matrix}\right\} \\ &= (\vec{u}\hat{\vec{k}})u_j^\dagger(kr)P_Lu_l(kr)\left\{\begin{matrix} +1 \\ -1 \end{matrix}\right\} \\ &= (\vec{u}\hat{\vec{k}})\left\{\begin{matrix} +s_js_l \\ -c_jc_l \end{matrix}\right\} \text{ for } r=\left\{\begin{matrix} +1 \\ -1 \end{matrix}\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{A9}$$

$$\begin{aligned} u_j^\dagger(k\uparrow)(\vec{\sigma}\vec{u})P_Lu_l(k\downarrow) &= \frac{1}{2}u_j^\dagger(k\uparrow)[(\vec{\sigma}\hat{\vec{k}}),(\vec{\sigma}\vec{u})]P_Lu_l(k\downarrow) \\ &= i(\hat{\vec{k}}\times\vec{u})u_j^\dagger(k\uparrow)\vec{\sigma}P_Lu_l(k\downarrow)\not\equiv 0, \end{aligned} \tag{A10}$$

and similar relations for other combinations among the momentum-helicity eigenfunctions.

(r,s)	$(\uparrow,\uparrow)$	$(\downarrow,\downarrow)$	$(\uparrow,\downarrow)$	$(\downarrow,\uparrow)$
$u_j^\dagger(kr)P_Lu_l(ks)$	s_js_l	c_jc_l	0	0
$v_j^\dagger(-kr)P_Lv_l(-ks)$	c_jc_l	s_js_l	0	0
$u_j^\dagger(kr)P_Lv_l(-ks)$	is_jc_l	$-ic_js_l$	0	0
$v_j^\dagger(-kr)P_Lu_l(ks)$	$-ic_js_l$	is_jc_l	0	0

Table I.

APPENDIX B: EIGENVALUES OF $H_{(M)}^{MATT}$ IN THE EXTREME-RELATIVISTIC CASE

We examine the eigenvalues of $H_{(M)}^{matt}(kr)$, i.e. the solutions of

$$\det[H_{(M)}^{matt}(kr)-\lambda]=0 \quad , \quad r=\uparrow,\downarrow \, . \tag{B1}$$

First we consider $H_{(M)}^{matt}(k\downarrow)$, because it has a relation with $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_F(k\downarrow;x^0)$-operators of the neutrinos produced through the weak V-A interaction; then, from (2.31)(or (3.18)) we examine the equation

$$\begin{aligned}\det[H_{(M)}^{matt}(k\downarrow)-\lambda] &= (\lambda^2-k^2-m_1^2)(\lambda^2-k^2-m_2^2)\\ &\quad -(\lambda+k)\left\{\kappa_{11}(\lambda^2-k^2-m_2^2)+\kappa_{22}(\lambda^2-k^2-m_1^2)\right\}+(\lambda+k)^2\det\kappa=0.\end{aligned} \tag{B2}$$

We search its approximate solutions in the *extreme-relativistic case* (2.35) by taking into consideration all terms of $1/k^2$-order in comparison with 1. Thus, the lowest order solutions of (B2) are $\lambda=\pm k$, so that we examine solutions in the neighborhoods of k and $-k$ separately, which we call hereafter (+)- and (−)-solutions, respectively.

1. (+)-solutions

Eq.(B2) is rewritten as

$$\det[H_{(M)}^{matt}(k\downarrow)-\lambda]=(\lambda+k)^2F_{(+)}^{\downarrow}(\lambda)=0, \tag{B3}$$

where

$$F_{(+)}^{\downarrow}(\lambda)\equiv(\lambda-k)^2-(\lambda-k)\left\{\frac{m_1^2+m_2^2}{\lambda+k}+(\kappa_{11}+\kappa_{22})\right\}+\left\{\frac{m_1^2m_2^2}{(\lambda+k)^2}+\frac{\kappa_{11}m_2^2+\kappa_{22}m_1^2}{\lambda+k}+\det\kappa\right\}. \tag{B4}$$

The discriminant $D_{(+)}$ of $F_{(+)}^{\downarrow}(\lambda)$, regarded as a quadratic equation with respect to $(\lambda-k)$, is

$$D_{(+)}=\left\{\frac{\Delta m^2}{\lambda+k}-b_1\cos(2\theta)\right\}^2+b_1^2\sin^2(2\theta); \tag{B5}$$

thus, the (+)-solutions satisfy

$$\lambda_{(+)}-k=\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{m_1^2+m_2^2}{\lambda_{(+)}+k}+2b_0+b_1\right)\pm\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{D_{(+)}(\lambda_{(+)})}. \tag{B6}$$

With the aim of comparing (B6) with (2.61), we define

$$\lambda_{(+)+}-k=\frac{\tilde m_{(+)2}(\downarrow)^2}{2k} \quad , \quad \lambda_{(+)-}-k=\frac{\tilde m_{(+)1}(\downarrow)^2}{2k}; \tag{B7}$$

here, $\lambda_{(+)+}$ and $\lambda_{(+)-}$ correspond to the solutions with the signs + and −, respectively, in front of $\sqrt{D_{(+)}}$ in (B6). Then we have

$$\tilde m_{(+)2}(\downarrow)^2=\frac{\bar m^2}{1+\tilde m_{(+)2}(\downarrow)^2/(4k^2)}+A_0+\frac{1}{2}[A+\sqrt{D_{(+)}(\lambda_{(+)+})(2k)^2}], \tag{B8}$$

$$\tilde m_{(+)1}(\downarrow)^2=\frac{\bar m^2}{1+\tilde m_{(+)1}(\downarrow)^2/(4k^2)}+A_0+\frac{1}{2}[A-\sqrt{D_{(+)}(\lambda_{(+)-})(2k)^2}]. \tag{B9}$$

In accordance with the explanation concerning the approximation given in Sec.II.B, we have the approximate forms of $D_{(+)}(\lambda_{(+)\pm})$ expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}D_{(+)}(\lambda_{(+)+})(2k)^2 &= \{\frac{\Delta m^2}{1+\tilde m_{(+)2}(\downarrow)^2/(4k^2)}-A\cos(2\theta)\}^2+\{A\sin(2\theta)\}^2;\\ &\simeq\{\Delta m^2-A\cos(2\theta)\}^2+\{A\sin(2\theta)\}^2,\end{aligned} \tag{B10}$$

$$D_{(+)}(\lambda_{(+)-})(2k)^2\simeq\{\Delta m^2-A\cos(2\theta)\}^2+\{A\sin(2\theta)\}^2; \tag{B11}$$

thus we have

$$\begin{pmatrix}\tilde m_{(+)1}(\downarrow)^2\\ \tilde m_{(+)2}(\downarrow)^2\end{pmatrix}\simeq\bar m^2+A_0+\frac{1}{2}\{A+\sqrt{(A-\Delta m^2\cos(2\theta))^2+(\Delta m^2\sin(2\theta))^2}\begin{pmatrix}-1\\+1\end{pmatrix}\}, \tag{B12}$$

which coincide with the usually utilized expressions $\tilde m_j(\downarrow)^2$'s given by (2.62).

2. (−)-solutions

Eq.(B2) is rewritten as

$$\det[H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow)-\lambda] \;=\; (\lambda-k)^2 F^{\downarrow}_{(-)}(\lambda)=0, \tag{B13}$$

$$F^{\downarrow}_{(-)}(\lambda) \;\equiv\; (\lambda+k)^2\{1-\frac{\kappa_{11}+\kappa_{22}}{\lambda-k}+\frac{\det\kappa}{(\lambda-k)^2}\}+(\lambda+k)\left\{-\frac{m_1^2+m_2^2}{\lambda-k}+\frac{\kappa_{11}m_2^2+\kappa_{22}m_1^2}{(\lambda-k)^2}\right\}+\frac{m_1^2m_2^2}{(\lambda-k)^2}, \tag{B14}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Discriminant } D_{(-)} &= \left\{-\frac{m_1^2+m_2^2}{\lambda-k}+\frac{\kappa_{11}m_2^2+\kappa_{22}m_1^2}{(\lambda-k)^2}\right\}^2-\frac{4m_1^2m_2^2}{(\lambda-k)^2}\left\{1-\frac{\kappa_{11}+\kappa_{22}}{\lambda-k}+\frac{\det\kappa}{(\lambda-k)^2}\right\}\\ &= \frac{1}{(\lambda-k)^2}\left[\left\{\Delta m^2-\frac{\kappa_{11}m_2^2-\kappa_{22}m_1^2}{\lambda-k}\right\}^2+\frac{4m_1^2m_2^2}{(\lambda-k)^2}\kappa_{12}^2\right];\end{aligned} \tag{B15}$$

thus, the (−)-solutions satisfy

$$\lambda_{(-)}+k=\frac{1}{2(1-\frac{b_0}{\lambda_{(-)}-k})(1-\frac{b_0+b_1}{\lambda_{(-)}-k})}\left[\frac{2\bar{m}^2}{\lambda_{(-)}-k}-\frac{(2b_0+b_1)\bar{m}^2+b_1\cos(2\theta)\Delta m^2/2}{(\lambda_{(-)}-k)^2}\mp\sqrt{D_{(-)}(\lambda_{(-)})}\right]. \tag{B16}$$

We define $\tilde{m}_j(\downarrow)^2, j=1,2$, as

$$\lambda_{(-)-}+k=-\frac{\tilde{m}_{(-)2}(\downarrow)^2}{2k} \quad , \quad \lambda_{(-)+}+k=-\frac{\tilde{m}_{(-)1}(\downarrow)^2}{2k}. \tag{B17}$$

In the same approximation as before, we have

$$\sqrt{D_{(-)}(\lambda_{(-)\mp})(2k)^2}\simeq\sqrt{D_{(-)}(-k)(2k)^2}\simeq\Delta m^2; \tag{B18}$$

thus,

$$\tilde{m}_{(-)j}(\downarrow)^2\simeq m_j^2, \quad j=1,2. \tag{B19}$$

3. remarks

Similarly to the $H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\downarrow)$ case, we obtain the approximate eigenvalues of $H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\uparrow)$. We use the notations $\lambda_{(+)j}$ and $\lambda_{(-)j}(j=1,2)$ for expressing the solutions of $\det[H^{matt}_{(M)}(k\uparrow)-0]=0$. By comparing (2.26) and (2.30) with (2.27) and (2.31), respectively, we see the approximate eigenvalues are given by

$$\lambda_{(+)j}=k+\frac{\tilde{m}_{(+)j}(\uparrow)^2}{2k} \quad , \quad \lambda_{(-)j}=-k-\frac{\tilde{m}_{(-)j}(\uparrow)^2}{2k}, \tag{B20}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde{m}_{(+)j}(\uparrow)^2\simeq m_j^2,\\ &\begin{pmatrix}\tilde{m}_{(-)1}(\uparrow)^2\\ \tilde{m}_{(-)2}(\uparrow)^2\end{pmatrix}\simeq\bar{m}^2-A_0-\frac{1}{2}\{A+\sqrt{(A+\Delta m^2\cos(2\theta))^2+(\Delta m^2\sin(2\theta))^2}\begin{pmatrix}+1\\-1\end{pmatrix}\}.\end{aligned} \tag{B21}$$

As seen from the considerations described above in the present section, we obtain in the *extreme-relativistic case* the eigenvalues (B12) which coincide with the usually employed ones such as Eq.(2.62). This does not necessarily mean, as stressed in Sec.II.C, the validity of the usual relations among eigenvectors given below Eq.(2.62). In Sec.IV, this point is examined in detail.

Notice that an analogous situation is described in Ref. [7], where the neutrino propagators on the flavor vacuum were studied: although they share the same poles of the usual propagators defined on the mass vacuum, they correspond to different boundary conditions and lead to different oscillation amplitudes.

[1] P. D. Mannheim, Phys. Rev. D **37** (1988) 1935.

[2] C. Giunti, C. W. Kim, and U. W. Lee, Phys. Rev. D **45** (1992) 2414; C. Giunti, C. W. Kim, J. A. Lee, and U. W. Lee, ibid. **48** (1993) 4310.

[3] W. Grimus and P. Stockinger, Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 3414; W. Grimus and P. Stockinger, and S. Mohanty, ibid **59** (1999) 013011

[4] M. Blasone and G. Vitiello, Annals Phys. **244** (1995) 283 [Erratum-ibid. **249** (1995) 363].

[5] K. Fujii, C. Habe and T. Yabuki, Phys. Rev. D **59** (1999) 113003 [Erratum-ibid. D **60** (1999) 099903].

[6] M. Blasone and G. Vitiello, Phys. Rev. **D60** (1999) 111302.

[7] M. Blasone, in "Erice 1998, From the Planck length to the Hubble radius" 584, [hep-ph/9810329]; M. Blasone, P. A. Henning and G. Vitiello, Phys. Lett. B **451** (1999) 140; M. Blasone, P. Jizba and G. Vitiello, Phys. Lett. **B 517** (2001) 471.

[8] C. Y. Cardall, Phys. Rev. D **61** (2000) 073006; C. Y. Cardall and D. J. H. Chung, Phys. Rev. D **60** (1999) 073012.

[9] K. C. Hannabuss and D. C. Latimer, J. Phys. A**A33** (2000) 1369.

[10] K. Fujii, C. Habe and T. Yabuki, Phys. Rev. D **64** (2001) 013011.

[11] M. Blasone, A. Capolupo and G. Vitiello, Phys. Rev. D **66** (2002) 025033;

[12] C. R. Ji and Y. Mishchenko, Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002) 096015.

[13] T. Yabuki and K. Ishikawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **108** (2002) 347.

[14] M. Beuthe, Phys. Rev. D **66** (2002) 013003. M. Beuthe, [hep-ph/0109119]. In the references of this report, we can find enough papers published till the middle of year 2001.

[15] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. D **17** (1978) 2369; S. P. Mikheyev and A. Y. Smirnov, Nuovo Cimento **9C** (1986) 17.

[16] E.g., E. Cornaldesi, Nucl. Phys. Z **64** (1958) 305.

[17] J. C. D'Olivo, J. F. Nieves, and M. Torres, Phys. Rev. D **46** (1992) 1172.

[18] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, Physics and Astrophysics of Neutrinos, edited by M. Fukugita and A. Suzuki (Springer-Verlag Tokyo, 1994), p.1; S. M. Bilenky, Lectures given at the 1999 European School of High Energy Physics, Casta Papiemicka, Slovakia, Aug. 22-Sep.4, 1992.

[19] H. Umezawa, in Lectures of Nuclear Physics, edited by S. Kikuchi et.al. (Kyoritu Schuppan, Tokyo, 1963), Vol.12.

[20] H. A. Bethe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56** (1986) 1305.

[21] L. D. Landau, Phys. Z. USSR **1** (1922) 426; C. Zenner, Proc. Roy. Soc. A **137** (1932) 6966.

[22] W. C. Hexton, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**(1986), 1271; S. J. Parke, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57** (1986) 1276.

[23] T. Kaneko, Y. Ohnuki, and K. Watanabe, Prog. Theor. Phys. **30** (1963) 521.

[24] K. Fujii and C. Habe, in preparation.